

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Number	10/726,624	Confirmation No.:	5743
Applicant	Ali Alavi		
Filed	12/04/2003		
Title	HTML/DHTML Web Interface System and Method		
TC/Art Unit	2165		
Examiner:	Yicun Wu		
Docket No.	53470.003060		
Customer No.	21967		

CORRECTED APPEAL BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Real Party In Interest.....	1
II. Related Appeals And Interferences.....	1
III. Status Of Claims.....	1
IV. Status Of Amendments.....	1
V. Summary Of Invention.....	2
A. The Embodiments Of The Present Invention.....	2
B. Explanation of Independent claim 1.....	2
C. Explanation of Independent Claim 14.....	3
VI. Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal	3
VII. Argument.....	4
A. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Thompson In View of Brooke.....	5
VIII. Conclusion.....	7
IX. APPENDIX A - Pending Claims	8
X. Evidence Appendix	11
XI. Related Proceedings Appendix	12

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Number	10/726,624	Confirmation No.:	5743
Applicant	Ali Alavi		
Filed	12/04/2003		
Title	HTML/DHTML Web Interface System and Method		
TC/Art Unit	2165		
Examiner:	Yicun Wu		
Docket No.	53470.003060		
Customer No.	21967		

APPEAL BRIEF

In response to the Office Action dated March 21, 2005, finally rejecting pending claims 1-20, appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record, and allow the pending claims, which are attached hereto as an Appendix.

I. Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is Microstrategy, Incorporated as assignee of the entire interest in the above-referenced application, assigned by its inventors.

II. Related Appeals And Interferences

There are no known related appeals.

III. Status Of Claims

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253 to Thompson et al. ("Thompson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,569 to Brooke et al. ("Brooke"). The rejection of claims 1-20 is appealed.

IV. Status Of Amendments

No amendments to the claims have been filed subsequent to the final rejection dated March 21, 2005.

V. Summary Of Invention

Appellant believes that a brief discussion of the background technology, followed by a brief summary of the embodiments of the invention and the problems solved by the embodiments of the present invention, will assist the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter referred to as “the Board”) in appreciating the significant advances made by the embodiments of the present invention.

A. The Embodiments Of The Present Invention

In accordance with the purposes of the invention as embodied and broadly described herein, there is provided a web interface system for use with a business information system, the web interface system providing an interface to a user. The web interface system comprises a first set of HTML interface tools located on a business intelligence server, the first set of HTML interface tools including at least one of spreadsheet tools, graphing tools, auto-prompt tools, and report generation and management tools. The web interface system additionally comprises a second set of HTML interface tools located on a web server, the second set of HTML interface tools including at least one of navigation tools and internationalization tools. The web interface system operates through providing communication between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the user, such that the user is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools.

B. Explanation of Independent claim 1

A web interface system (306) for use with a business information system (308), the web interface system providing an interface to a client computer and comprising a first set of HTML interface tools located on a business intelligence server, the first set of HTML interface tools including spreadsheet tools (316a), graphing tools (318), auto-prompt tools (312), and report management tools (314);

second set of HTML interface tools located on a web server, the second set of HTML interface tools including navigation tools (306a) and internationalization tools (306b); and

means for providing communication between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the client computer (12:3-9, 16:19-17:14, 350 and Figs. 3 and 4), such that the client computer is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools.

C. Explanation of Independent Claim 14

A method for providing a web interface (306) for a client computer through the use of a web server and a business intelligence server (308), the method comprising the steps of:

loading a first set of HTML interface tools on the business intelligence server (308), the first set of HTML interface tools including spreadsheet tools(316a), graphing tools (318), auto-prompt tools (312), and report management tools (314);

loading a second set of HTML interface tools located on the web server, the second set of HTML interface tools including navigation tools (306a) and internationalization tools (306b);
and

providing communication means between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the client computer, such that the client computer is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools (12:3-9, 16:19-17:14, 350 and Figs. 3 and 4).

VI. Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal

The following grounds of rejection are to be reviewed on appeal:

- 1) The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 1-20 based on Thompson in view of Brooke.

VII. Argument

The rejections of the claims in this case exemplify classic hindsight reconstruction that is contrary to the law. Controlling Federal Circuit and Board precedent require that the Office Action set forth specific and particularized motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a primary reference to achieve a claimed invention. *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 664 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“[t]o prevent a hindsight-based obviousness analysis, [the Federal Circuit has] clearly established that the relevant inquiry for determining the scope and content of the prior art is whether there is a reason, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art or elsewhere that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references.”). Here, the Office Action cobbles together two or three references to allegedly yield the claims based on unsupported allegations of what is “conventional.” These references all relate to different features without any specific teaching to be modified or combined into the claims presented by applicant. Then, for each dependent claim, the Office Action selects from amongst the two or three as though that were all that was required. For each such additional modification to the primary reference, the Office has the burden to establish motivation for that additional modification as well.

Simply put, the Office has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness for any of the independent claims. Additionally, the Office has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the further modifications proposed to yield the dependent claims as well. Each of the specific claims and the impropriety of the rejections is addressed below.

A. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Thompson In View of Brooke

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253 to Thompson et al. (“Thompson”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,569 to Brooke et al. (“Brooke”).

Thompson discloses “a transformation and staging server connected to [a] data warehouse server...; a financial consolidation application connected to the transformation and staging server for performing consolidation and reporting of financial data; a web server connected to the data warehouse server; and a plurality of clients connectable to the web server for accessing data from the data warehouse server via the web server.” Thompson Abstract. In Thompson, users may view reports and interact with data processed at a central processing system.

Claims 1 and 14 recite “navigation tools” and “internationalization tools” that are “located on [a] web server.” Claims 2-13 and 15-20 depend from claims 1 and 14 and thereby incorporate this feature by reference. Thompson fails to teach or suggest this feature. The Office Action concedes that Thompson fails to teach “internationalization tools,” but it asserts that the “navigation tools” are taught by Figure 2 of Thompson. Figure 2 shows an exemplary structure of the Thompson user interface, showing what appears to be an Internet Explorer browser screen comprising “user tasks and report list” text, a “search” icon, a “guide me” icon, and enterprise information management buttons. Nothing about Figure 2’s content or description teaches tools that are “located on [a] web server.” Rather, Figure 2 and its corresponding description in the specification are silent in regard to the “location” of any tools.

Elsewhere in the specification, Thompson discloses the following in regard to “software location”:

The EIM application runs on personal computers (PCs) with Windows95.TM., Windows98.TM., or Windows NT.TM. operating systems. The application functionality is delivered through the PC's web browser. The only web browser that EIM supports in one preferred embodiment is Microsoft's Internet Explorer version 4.01 or greater. Generally, EIM's present embodiments operate on browsers with support for ActiveX controls and Visual Basic Scripting.

The report and graph viewing capabilities is delivered with the aid of the "DSS Graph" and "DSS Grid" ActiveX controls that are delivered with MicroStrategy's product set. In addition, the report creation and auto-prompting wizards are written as Java.TM. applets, provided by MicroStrategy. The remaining application functionality delivered by EIM is preferably through Dynamic HTML pages.

Thompson, col. 30, lines 44-58.

Neither the cited passage nor Figure 2 explicitly disclose "navigation tools" that are "located on [a] web server" as recited by the claims. Nor is this recitation inherently disclosed, because it is not typical for navigation tools to be stored on a web server in this context.

Brooke is directed to an "XML Server Pages Language" and does not remedy the deficiencies of Thompson. Thus, the combination of Thompson and Brooke does not teach or suggest claims 1-20.

Although the Office Action acknowledges that Thompson fails to disclose internationalization tools on the web server, it alleges that such tools are disclosed by Brooke. In

alleging that it would have been obvious to modify Thompson in view of Brooke, however, the Office states that it would be obvious to do so to “improve flexibility.” The Office fails to identify where in Brooke that such a teaching is made and moreover, that teaching still fails to inform one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the internationalization tools at the web server, which is contrary to the placement of such tools in this context. The Office never addresses the location issue and thus, have failed to provide a prima facie case of obviousness.


In view of the foregoing, the § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-20 cannot stand.

VIII. Conclusion

Because the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combinations set forth in the pending claims, and further fail to provide any motivation or suggestion of the desirability of modifying the structures or methods to arrive at the claimed combinations, appellant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the prior art rejections set forth in the Action, and allow all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

August 10, 2006



Brian M. Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

Hunton & Williams
1900 K. St., NW, Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1894

IX. APPENDIX A - Pending Claims

What is claimed is:

1. (Original) A web interface system for use with a business information system, the web interface system providing an interface to a client computer and comprising:

a first set of HTML interface tools located on a business intelligence server, the first set of HTML interface tools including spreadsheet tools, graphing tools, auto-prompt tools, and report management tools;

second set of HTML interface tools located on a web server, the second set of HTML interface tools including navigation tools and internationalization tools; and

means for providing communication between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the client computer, such that the client computer is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools.
2. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the first set of HTML interface tools located on the business intelligence server obtains results through communication with a plurality of storage facilities.
3. (Original) The web interface system of claim 2, wherein the plurality of storage devices includes cache files, object data, and a data warehouse.
4. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the auto-prompting tools comprise means for enabling a client to specify filtering criteria.
5. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the auto-prompting tools additionally comprise DHTML tools.
6. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the report management tools comprise means for enabling a client to specify the full report to be viewed.

7. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the report management tools additionally comprise pull-down menus in HTML.
8. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the report management tools comprise DHTML pivoting tools for enabling movement of attributes within an executed report.
9. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the spreadsheet tools comprise pop-up menus for controlling drilling, outlining, sorting, and formatting options.
10. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, further comprising additional HTML spreadsheet functions provided on the web server.
11. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the graphing tools comprise means for generating a graph inside of the business intelligence server and creating a file for transmitting to the web server computer for conversion to HTML.
12. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the internationalization tools comprise means for communicating in one of a plurality of languages.
13. (Original) The web interface system of claim 1, wherein the navigation tools comprise means for simultaneous display of toolbars, menus, and a grid on the client computer.
14. (Original) A method for providing a web interface for a client computer through the use of a web server and a business intelligence server, the method comprising the steps of:

loading a first set of HTML interface tools on the business intelligence server, the first set of HTML interface tools including spreadsheet tools, graphing tools, auto-prompt tools, and report management tools;

loading a second set of HTML interface tools located on the web server, the second set of HTML interface tools including navigation tools and internationalization tools; and

providing communication means between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the client computer, such that the client computer is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools.

15. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising the step of providing a plurality of storage devices for communication with the first set of HTML interface tools on the business intelligence server, wherein the plurality of storage devices includes cache files, object data, and a data warehouse.

16. (Original) The method of claim 14, wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading DHTML auto-prompting tools having means for enabling a client to specify filtering criteria.

17. (Original) The method of claim 14, wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading means for enabling a client to specify the full report to be viewed and means for providing pull-down menus in HTML.

18. (Original) The method claim 14, wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading DHTML pivoting tools for enabling movement of attributes within an executed report.

19. (Original) The method of claim 14, wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading pop-up menus for controlling drilling, outlining, sorting, and formatting options.

20. (Original) The method of claim 14, further comprising loading additional HTML spreadsheet functions provided on the web server.

53470.003060
Application No. 10/726,624

X. Evidence Appendix
None.

53470.003060
Application No. 10/726,624

XI. Related Proceedings Appendix
None.